



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/783,768

02/20/2004

Mark Harper

MS301437.01/40062.0221US0

6660

7590 07/24/2008  
Homer L. Knearl  
Merchant & Gould P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

BAUTISTA, XIOMARA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/24/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/783,768	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARPER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> X. L. Bautista	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-8,12-14,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-8,12-14,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6-8, 12-14, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Specification*

2. The disclosure (page 3, par. 0030, penultimate line) is objected to because of the following informalities: "or the container" should be changed to --of the container--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 6-8, 12-14, 19 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kruempelmann et al** (US 7,191,410 B1) and **Joseph** (5,873,106).

#### Claim 1:

**Kruempelmann** discloses a system and method for managing information (abstract). Kruempelmann teaches detecting an edit operation for an object displayed on the video display (col. 2, lines 1-32); and sending the edit operation request to an

abstraction layer to initiate editing of the object by the abstraction layer (col. 3, lines 48-49, 58-67; col. 6, lines 7-46, 53-67). Kruempelmann teaches that the user can customize a user interface by changing the parameters (col. 9, lines 34-42).

Kruempelmann teaches determining a container type for a container in which the object is displayed (col. 1, lines 25-31; col. 2, lines 20-32; col. 6, lines 7-46); reading a set of properties related to the object to be edited (col. 9, lines 34-42); reading a set of properties related to the container in which the object is displayed to determine the type for the container (col. 1, lines 40-67; col. 2, lines 1-5; col. 4, lines 10-32); and editing the object based on the container type and the received edit operation request (col. 7, lines 35-67; col. 8, lines 21-35, 52-67; col. 9, lines 1-16).

Kruempelmann does not teach that the abstraction layer receives only the application parameters associated with an editing request detected by the application, and based on those parameters associated with the container and properties of the object contained within the container, the abstraction layer is able to edit the object. However, **Joseph** discloses a geometry management system that determines the ideal and default attributes of objects (abstract). Joseph teaches that when a child object requires resizing, the child object requests geometry from the parent container object, and based on those parameters, the container determines whether a given geometry is feasible, and if the parameters are acceptable, the container implements the geometry (col. 2, lines 26-38). Joseph explains that every container contains layout management built into the container and that when the container is a configurable container (type) the

layout management policy is determined by the geometry manager bound to the container, and non configurable containers (type) are governed by the corresponding geometry management scheme implemented for the non configurable containers (col. 3, lines 43-63; col. 4, lines 46-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kruempelmann's method of editing objects to include Joseph's teaching of using a geometry management system that determines the ideal and default sizes of objects and that uses the parameters of the parent container and the child object to edit the child object because it facilitates managing and editing layout displays, especially when the container and its contained objects have different geometric relationships.

Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, 19 and 20:

Kruempelmann teaches modifying properties of the object (col. 4, lines 4-31; col. 8, lines 52-67; col. 9, lines 1-16) and container (col. 5, lines 16-55; col. 7, lines 35-56; col. 9, lines 17-65).

Claim 8:

See claim 1. Kruempelmann teaches a system having a processor and memory (col. 3, lines 28-36).

Claim 14:

See claim 1. Kruempelmann teaches a machine-readable storage medium encoding a computer program of instructions for editing objects (col. 15, lines 1-15).

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to X. L. Bautista whose telephone number is (571) 272-4132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/X. L. Bautista/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

July 18, 2008